MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D. C., September 19, 1942

The second meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1943 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Saturday, September 19, 1942. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman
Mr. Lamb,
Dr. Cret,
Mr. Holabird,
Mr. Poor,
Mr. Stackpole,

also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

1. INSPECTION OF THE BLUE ROOM AT THE WHITE HOUSE: In accordance with arrangements made with Mr. H. G. Crim, Chief Usher, the Commission convened at the White House at 10.00 a.m. to inspect the work done in redecorating the Blue Room. Mrs. Harold I. Pratt and Mrs. Harry H. Benkard, representing the Committee on White House Furnishings, took part in the inspection.

Mr. Crim presented a letter received from the Richmond Art Company stating that they had completed the work done in the Blue Room.

The Commission inspected the work but were not satisfied with it. The Commission noted no real improvement in the repair work in so far as carrying out criticisms made by the Commission at the meeting held on June 19, 1942. The seams still show, the border was irregular and the repair work done around the lighting fixtures looked like patchwork; also an electric light switch had been placed very inappropriately directly on the border, thus disfiguring it.

Mrs. Pratt said, in her opinion, any work of redecorating in the White House was of such importance that the ablest talent should be secured for

the work and that a contract should not necessarily be awarded to the "lowest bidder." In this the Commission concurred. It was noted that there were no specifications for the contractor to follow.

Mrs. Pratt advised that, in the future, any work of redecorating in the White House should be taken up in consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts.

Mrs. Benkard said the wall lighting brackets should have been removed before new material was placed on the walls of the Blue Room. The center chandelier, in the French style, should some day be replaced by one of the period of the White House.

After careful consideration, the Commission decided to recommend that the work be disapproved but also accepted since it would be impossible to redecorate the Blue Room during the War period and thus what has been done, even though in an unsatisfactory manner, must remain for the duration. It was pointed out that all the weaving was done by hand. No fault was found with the draperies.

Mrs. Pratt suggested that the Commission of Fine Arts consider a program for redecorating and refurnishing the entire first floor of the White House after consultation with the Joint Committee on the Library.

A report was sent to Mr. Crim. (Exhibit A).

2. EXHIBITION ROOMS FOR THE NEW EAST WING OF THE WHITE HOUSE: Under date of September 9, 1942, the following letter was received from President Roosevelt concerning Exhibition Rooms which he has proposed in the new East Wing of the White House:

September 9, 1942.

My dear Mr. Chairman:-

I wish you would discuss the following matter with the Commission of Fine Arts.

Owing to the war emergency and the need for additional space and for a bomb-proof shelter, the old East Wing of the White House was torn down and the new building is now practically completed. The plans had, I think, the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts.

It has long been my thought that because of the increase in the number of articles of historical interest in the White House itself, the matter of showing them to the public had reached an acute stage. The rooms downstairs containing china and other mementos of former Presidents are, of course, wholly inadequate for this purpose. Furthermore, during the past ten years I have had many offers of actual pieces of furniture and other mementos from the families of former Presidents and others.

Therefore, it was my thought at least eight years ago, when the newest West Wing was built, that something similar should be done with the East Wing, using an enlarged East Wing primarily as a Museum open to the public.

I think that we could devote a number of rooms to certain periods -- as for instance a room covering the Presidents from the first Adams through the second Adams; another room from the 1828 period up to the time of the Civil War; another room from 1865 through, let us say, the McKinley period; and another room from Theodore Roosevelt down to date. This kind of arrangement could, of course, be modified and the number of rooms devoted to separate periods increased to an almost unlimited extent.

The new East Wing will, during the war, be occupied by certain war services, and there will not be much room left for Museum rooms. However, certain articles are still being offered to the White House.

It is my thought that the Commission of Fine Arts should properly pass on all of these articles which would go into the East Wing in the same way that the Commission now passes on articles that go into the White House proper. Certain simple rules should be made. As for example, the giving of priorities to pieces of furniture, pictures and personal belongings which were actually used by a given President in the White House during his term of office.

Every period should be represented: As for instance, the period of Chester A. Arthur which, in relation to furniture and other things, probably represented the highest achievement in bad art ever perpetrated on this nation. However, I have an offer of a desk and chair which were used by President Arthur while in the White House. They are most certainly illustrative of the period, and I am inclined to think that the Commission of Fine Arts would rule favorably on their acceptance.

Please let me have your views on this general subject.

Then if it is impossible to display any accepted articles until after the war, we could at least accept them in the meantime and preserve them for future display.

Hon. Gilmore D. Clarke,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

The Chairman had acknowledged receipt of the letter, (Exhibit B).

The Commission inspected the rooms in company with Mr. Lorenzo S. Winslow, architect. Mr. Winslow explained the plan of the rooms for the first floor which is to consist of "Period Rooms" and called attention to the provision made for receiving guests at White House receptions. At the entrance is a porte-cochere for which all the old columns of the former similar structure were retained.

An inspection was then made of the second floor where there is to be a large museum room, fully 80 feet in length, although during the War period this space will be used for offices. The basement provides for quarters for the guards as well as a shelter.

The Commission were aware of the fact that the President's suggestion to transform the new East Wing into a museum after the war will accomplish two things: 1. Keep a vast number of visitors out of the White House; 2. Preserve the integrity of the White House as the Mansion of the Chief Executive by making it possible to remove many miscellaneous furniture and other items which have been presented in years past, including portraits, and thus preserve the dignity of the White House as the residence of the Chief Executive of the nation.

The Chairman sent a report to the President. (Exhibit C).

3. SHELTER FOR PATRONS OF STREET CARS AT UNION STATION: The following letter was received from Mr. D. M. Nelson, Manager of The Washington Terminal Company, together with a sketch:

September 14, 1942.

Dear Mr. Gaemmerer:

I am sending you the enclosed sketch showing continuation of shelter in front of Union Station to the first Street car platform, in connection with our conversation.

After it has served your purpose, will you kindly return it to me.

Yours very truly,

D. M. Nelson

The Commission considered the matter in relation to the taxicab shelter that has just been completed. The Commission felt that this had been built in a satisfactory manner as a temporary project but to allow the extension of the shelter for street cars would mean raising the roof of the shelter, which would be objectionable. The Commission were convinced that such a large shelter would be an eyesore in front of one of the main buildings of the National Capital and there has been no indication that a shelter for street car patrons is particularly needed. The shelter would also come close to the Columbus Monument.

The Secretary was requested to inform Mr. Tolson that the Commission of Fine Arts disapproved the erection of the proposed shelter for street car patrons and that in allowing the shelter for taxicab service as a temporary scheme, the Commission had reached the elastic limit. (Exhibit D).

4. AIR MEDAL, WAR DEPARTMENT: Colonel B. E. Nowland of the General Staff, War Department, submitted designs and models for a proposed "Air Medal" received from sculptors as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT
Office of the Quartermaster General
Washington

SPQRR 421
(Air Medal) August 29, 1942.

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Design for Air Medal.
TO: Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1.

1. In continuation of memorandum to this office, July 28, 1942, the designs furnished under separate cover received for the Air Medal have been sent in by the various competitors listed below:

Mr. Gaetano Cecere, one drawing containing three designs. Inclosure 1
Mr. C. P. Jennewein, three designs. Inclosures - 2,3,4
Mr. T. A. Rovelstad, one design. Inclosure 5
Mr. Walker Hancock, four designs. Inclosures - 6,7,8,9
Mr. Chester Beach, four designs. Inclosures - 10,11,12,13
Mr. John Flanagan, one design. Inclosure 14

Mr. Edmond Amateis, two designs. Inclosures - 15,16
Mr. Robert Aitken, one design. Inclosure 17
Mr. Charles Keck, two designs. Inclosures - 18,19
Mr. Edward McCartan, one design. Inclosure 20
Mr. George Lober, one design. Inclosure 21
Mr. Ulric Ellerhusen, one design. Inclosure 22
Mr. Anthony De Francisci, two models. Inclosures - 23,24
Mr. Thomas H. Jones, one sketch of 6 designs. Inclosure 25
Mrs. Laura Gardin Fraser, one design and model. Inclosure 26 and model
(There is no inclosure 27)
Mr. James Earle Fraser, one design and seven models. Inclosure 28 and 7 models

2. The correspondence received from submitting sculptors is enclosed.

3. It is recommended that these designs be transmitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for their advice prior to selecting and approving one of the designs.

4. There are enclosed illustrations of proposed ribbons submitted by Mr. Rovelstad for these decorations.

For the Quartermaster General:

HUGH B. HESTER,
Colonel, Q. M. C.,
Assistant.

45 Incls.
Incls. 1 to 35, incl.
(Under separate cover)
Incls. 36 to 45, incl.
(Enclosed herewith)

The Commission noted that the War Department made the following recommendation as to the designs:

WAR DEPARTMENT
Headquarters of the Army Air Forces
Washington September 2, 1942.

MEMORANDUM FOR ASST. CHIEF OF STAFF, G-1:

Subject: Designs of Air Medal.

The Commanding General, Army Air Forces, has selected designs of the Air Medal submitted in the following order with the changes indicated:

(1) Inclosure 4, submitted by C. P. Jennewein with replacement of the eagle thereon by the eagle now on the design submitted by him for the American Zone campaign medal with the head of the eagle facing to the dexter side and the eagle grasping in his claws arrows instead of an olive branch.

(2) Inclosure 26, submitted by Laura G. Fraser with the sextant deleted.

(3) Unlisted inclosure consisting of plaster casts, submitted by J.E. Fraser, with the airplanes deleted.

For the Chief of the Air Staff:

F. TRUBEE DAVISON,
Colonel, G.S.C.,
Asst. Chief of Air Staff, A-1.

The Commission inspected the designs. Later in the afternoon Colonel Nowland and Colonel Hanley called and took part in the discussion.

After giving the designs and models careful consideration, the Commission came to the conclusion that two submissions were especially meritorious. One of these was submitted by C. P. Jennewein and the other by Walker Hancock. Rather than attempt to make a definite recommendation at this time, the Commission felt that it would not be unreasonable to request these two sculptors to present sketch models in plaster, six inches in diameter. The Commission would then be in a better position to determine which of the two designs should be selected. A more detailed outline of the particular designs is as follows:

1. WALKER HANCOCK
   Obverse:
   Central motif of Design C (Marked Inclosure 8 on list) to be developed on star Design A (marked Inclosure 6 on list), with broader points and without rounded tips.
   Central circle, including eagle, to be larger in proportion to the entire medal.
   Reverse:
   Circular area plain. Delineate compass points only.
   Submit plaster sketch model, 6 inches in diameter, of obverse only, in competition with one other sculptor.

2. C. PAUL JENNEWEIN
   Obverse:
   Design No. 4. Restudy eagle.
   While the Chief of the Army Air Forces preferred the eagle shown on "obverse of American Zone," we believe that one to be too stereotyped and similar to the eagle on a number of other medals.
   Reverse:
   Circular area plain. Delineate compass points only.
   Submit plaster model, 6 inches in diameter, of obverse only, in competition with one other sculptor.

A report was sent to Colonel Nowland recommending that he notify Mr. Jennewein and Mr. Hancock of the recommendations of the Commission in this matter. (Exhibit E).

5. "THEATER OF OPERATIONS" MEDALS, WAR DEPARTMENT: Colonel B.E. Nowland of the General Staff submitted designs and models for proposed "Theater of Operations" Medals. Colonel Nowland and Colonel Hanley were present and took part in the discussion.

Colonel Nowland said that there is no great hurry about these medals since an Executive Order to issue these medals has not as yet been signed by the President. In view of the fact that millions of the medals will be needed, (involving an expenditure of perhaps three or four million dollars), it will probably be necessary to postpone action to strike the medals until after the War in view of the lack of metal until that time.

Designs and models for these medals were received from the following sculptors:

WAR DEPARTMENT
Office of the Quartermaster General
Washington

SPQRR 421
(Service Medals) August 29, 1942.

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Designs for Service Medals for the Combat Theatres.
TO: Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1
Attention: Colonel Nowland

1. In accordance with letter about August 4, 1942 requesting designs for service medals for the Combat Theatres, there are transmitted under separate cover designs submitted by various sculptors as follows:

Mr. Edmond Amateis - Inclosures 1, 2 and 3
Mr. G. Cecere - Inclosures 4 and 5
Mr. Anthony D. Francisci - Inclosures 6 to 11 inclusive
Mr. Chester Beach - Inclosure 12
Mr. Ulrich Ellerhusen - Inclosures 13 to 17 inclusive
Mr. C. P. Jennewein - Inclosures 18 to 22 inclusive
Mr. T. Jones - Inclosure 23
Mr. T. A. Rovelstad - Inclosures 24 to 27 inclusive.

2. The Correspondence transmitting the various designs are inclosed as follows:

Mr. Anthony D. Francisci - Inclosure 28
Mr. Chester Beach - Inclosure 29
Mr. Ulrich Ellerhusen - Inclosure 30
Mr. T. Jones - Inclosure 31.

3. It is suggested that these designs be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for their advice prior to selecting a final design and approval thereof.

For the Quartermaster General:

HUGH B. HESTER,
Colonel, Q. M. C.,
Assistant

31 Inclosures:
Inclosures 1 to 27 inclusive:
Designs (Under separate cover)
Inclosures 28 to 31 inclusive:
Correspondence (Herewith).

The Commission felt that the designs indicated a lack of a full comprehension of the problem involved which was reflected in the sameness in a number of the sketches for these medals. Colonel Nowland said the War Department itself is somewhat uncertain about the border line of some of these combat areas; that in the first World War of 1917-18 all the American soldiers went to Europe but in this War they are being sent to all parts of the world. At present there are four great theaters of operations: American, European, African, and Asiatic-Pacific.

After discussion the Commission reached the following conclusions:

1. That the competitors who have already submitted designs for these medals be advised that the judgment has been postponed until a later date in order to give each sculptor more time for study and to permit others to submit designs in accordance with a detailed program of competition.

2. That the medalists or sculptors who have already submitted designs should be given the opportunity to add to or to revise their designs and to submit new ideas if they so desire. The designs already submitted should be retained, unless the competitor requests that they be returned. If not returned, they will be judged with the drawings submitted later.

3. That after the new designs have all been received by the War Department, this Commission will meet to review them and to make specific recommendations after conference with Colonel Nowland.

4. That at least one month be given to all competitors and that the designs be submitted on white paper mounted on board, as specified in the program, except that designs already submitted will be accepted in the manner in which they have been presented and without prejudice with respect to the method of presentation. While it would be desirable to have all designs submitted as models in plaster, it appears impractical, in this case, to require more than drawings in order to be fair to those who have already made submissions. Hereafter submissions for medals should be in plaster as may be specified later.

5. It is further suggested that all those who were invited to submit designs in the competition for the Air Corps Medal be invited to present designs for all four, or for any one, two, or three of the Theater of Operations medals.

6. It is suggested that, in addition to those medalists invited to submit designs for the Air Corps Medal, the following named be invited:-

Mr. Paul Manship
319 East 72nd Street, New York
Mr. Leo Friedlander
P. O. Box 572, White Plains, N. Y.
Mr. Heinz Warneke
5 Washington Mews, New York
Mr. Henry Kreis
Essex, Connecticut
Mr. Robert B. Howard
521 Francisco Street
San Francisco, California
Mr. Frederick Olmsted
310 Filbert Street
San Francisco, California
Mr. Sargent C. Johnson
2101 Scott Street
Berkeley, California
Miss Berta Margoulies
333 Fourth Avenue, New York
Mr. Raymond Barger
36 East 23rd Street, New York

Also the Chairman drafted a program of competition in which the Commission concurred. This and a letter were sent as a report to Colonel Nowland. (Exhibit F).

(In view of report from Colonel Nowland that sculptors are to be allowed additional time for designs of this medal, the Chairman requested of Colonel Nowland that the sculptors be asked to submit plaster models. (Exhibit F-1). Colonel Nowland informed the Secretary on September 26 that the sculptors will be asked to submit models and will be allowed two months for same).

6. MEDALS AND INSIGNIA FROM THE WAR DEPARTMENT: In behalf of the War Department, Colonel Nowland presented a number of Army Air Corps Insignia and several War Department Medals for the Commission's collection of medals and insignia. The Commission inspected them and expressed their grateful appreciation of this gift. (Exhibit G).

7. DEVELOPMENT OF WASHINGTON STREET ALONG THE MOUNT VERNON HIGHWAY: The Secretary reported that in view of the fact that the City Council of Alexandria had expressed the desire that the Commission of Fine Arts assist them in providing for architectural control of Alexandria in connection with their zoning problems and in particular, the development of Washington Street along the Mount Vernon Highway, the Chairman had sent a letter to the City Manager of Alexandria suggesting the appointment of a Board of Advisers to have charge of the matter. The Commission concurred in this. (Exhibit H).

8. BRIDGE NO. 6 OVER BOUNDARY CHANNEL: Under date of September 17, the following letter was received from Mr. Joseph Barnett, Chief Design Engineer of the Public Roads Administration:-

September 17, 1942.

My dear Mr. Caemmerer:

Transmitted herewith is a print of Bridge No. 6 on the War Department Building Road Network to carry Lee Boulevard over Boundary Channel from the north end of Columbia Island. The drawing was prepared by the National Park Service who collaborated in the design of this structure.

It is our intention to place this bridge under contract at an early date to take advantage of the availability of the contractors and their equipment now completing similar structures on the network.

Your early consideration of this bridge will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,
Joseph Barnett,
Principal Highway Design Engineer.

Mr. Clarke said he had told Mr. Barnett this morning that the National Park Service had done a poor job in designing this bridge. There is a lot of unnecessary detail and the design should be restudied. The Commission concurred in this.

The Chairman sent a report to Mr. Barnett, recommending changes to be made, to be embodied in a revised design. (Exhibit I).

9. BRIDGE NO. 15 IN CONNECTION WITH WAR DEPARTMENT NETWORK: Under date of September 17, the following letter was received from Mr. Joseph Barnett, Chief Design Engineer of the Public Roads Administration, with a design for this project:

September 17, 1942

My dear Mr. Caemmerer:

Transmitted herewith is a print of our drawing No. 15-BR-4 being the architectural elevation of Bridge No. 15 on the War Department Building Road Network.

A glance at the map of the system will show you that this bridge is on Lee Boulevard near the entrance to Fort Myer quite a distance away from the other structures or this network. It was deemed undesirable to go to the expense of stone facing which accounts for the presentation of a concrete faced structure. This bridge together with Bridge 14 which is concrete faced with stone faced approach walls and Bridge 13 which is all stone faced will form a gradual transition from the stone faced bridges of the network to Lee Boulevard which is under the jurisdiction of the State Highway Department and on which

all structures will be concrete faced. The detail of the middle pier is still a little undecided as evidenced by the alternate sketch. We are working with clay models to arrive at a satisfactory design for this pier.

Early consideration of the Commission of Fine Arts of this structure will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,
Joseph Barnett,
Principal Highway Design Engineer.

The Commission inspected the design and were not at all satisfied with it. The design was disapproved, Dr. Cret not voting.

Mr. Clarke said he talked with Mr. Barnett this morning and suggested that Mr. Barnett send to the Commission some additional sketches and this he agreed to do. (Mr. Barnett submitted a revised design for the bridge on September 23 (Design No. 15-BR-05) which was submitted to the Chairman who approved it in behalf of the Commission. (Exhibit J).

10. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting held July 17, 1942 and of the Committee Meeting held on August 27, 1942 were approved.

11. MURAL PAINTING, WAR DEPARTMENT: The Secretary reported that Kindred McLeary had about completed his painting at the War Department Building at 22nd Street & Virginia Avenue. The painting is at the entrance of the building and is 50 feet long by 12 feet high. The Chairman stated that it would be impossible for the entire Commission to see the painting at this time. Thereupon Mr. Poor and Mr. Stackpole went to see the painting as also, Mr. Caemmerer, who sent a report on the subject to the Chairman. (Exhibit K).

The Commission adjourned at 4.15 p.m.

September 25, 1942

Dear Mr. Crim,

On Saturday, September 19, 1942, upon your suggestion, the Commission of Fine Arts made a final inspection of the Blue Room of the White House. Two members of the Commission's Committee on the White House, Mrs. Harold I. Pratt and Mrs. Harry Benkard, were also present, upon the invitation of the Chairman.

A letter addressed to you by the Richmond Art Company was read. It stated that they had completed the work incident to placing the silk wall coverings. While representatives of this Company attempted to correct the faulty workmanship, specifically described in a letter to you following the Commission's last visit of inspection of the Blue Room, it was clearly evident that the wall hangings had been imperfectly installed and that nothing further could be done to remedy the unsatisfactory results.

In view of this situation the Commission of Fine Arts feel impelled to disapprove the hangings in the Blue Room installed by the Richmond Art Company. Inasmuch as present conditions do not permit doing the work over again at this time, the Commission recommend that the work be accepted and the bill paid. Your attention is called to the fact that the Commission, in their last communication to you upon this subject, recommended acceptance of the window draperies supplied by the Richmond Art Company, included in the same order with the wall hangings.

It is respectfully urged, when work of this or of similar character is to be undertaken in connection with the public and state rooms of the Executive Mansion, or when changes or refurnishings are to be considered, that the Commission be advised well in advance of the time of placing such orders or contracts, to the end that improvements may be suggested and disappointments avoided. For example, the importance of providing adequate specifications (lacking in the recent order for redecorating the Blue Room) cannot be too strongly emphasized. It is self-evident that the Executive Mansion warrants that all materials be of the best quality, of appropriate design, and of the highest type of workmanship obtainable, and that all work be thoroughly harmonious with the period of the Executive Mansion.

Much remains to be done to bring the public rooms and the state rooms of the Executive Mansion to the state of perfection which this Commission and their Committee visualize. In our judgment, further research should be carried on and neither trouble nor expense should stand in the way of perfecting the general architectural treatment and the furnishings of the public rooms and of the state rooms so that they may represent the finest examples of the period of which the Executive Mansion itself is an outstanding example. At an appropriate time, after the war, the Commission hope that a suitable fund may be made available to accomplish these ends.

The Commission of Fine Arts have, in the membership of their Committee on the White House, the ablest talent available for advice with respect to the interior embellishment of the Executive Mansion and we are prepared to be of immediate service, in cooperation with you, to the end that whatever is done may be in every respect appropriate to the importance of the residence of the President of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke
Chairman

Mr. H. G. Crim,
Chief Usher,
The White House.

(EXHIBIT A)

September 11, 1942

My dear Mr. President,

This will acknowledge your communication dated September 9, concerning the acquisition by the Government of articles of historic interest which might be displayed in the new East Wing of the White House.

I recall that you discussed this matter with me not many months ago, when I was privileged to call at the White House, and I remember saying to you that, in my judgment, it would be eminently appropriate for the Government to acquire momentoes in the form of furniture or other articles which had been used by former Presidents of the United States, even including the furnishings exemplary of the period of Chester A. Arthur.

The Commission of Fine Arts will meet in Washington shortly. I shall bring your letter to the attention of the members at that time, after which I shall forward to you a formal communication setting forth the action of the Commission on this subject.

Be assured that we are anxious to cooperate with you to the end that the new East Wing may be developed in an interesting and appropriate manner, along the lines you have suggested.

Very sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

(EXHIBIT B)

September 21, 1942

My dear Mr. President,

I brought your letter of September 9 to the attention of the members of this Commission at a meeting held on Saturday, September 19, and during a visit of inspection to the new East Wing of the White House. Mr. Winslow met us and showed us about.

The Commission are all heartily in accord with your recommendation, ultimately to use this new wing as a public museum, thus to make it possible to restrict further the public use of the basement and first floors of the White House. While we anticipate that the public expects to continue to enjoy the privilege of viewing the principal rooms of the White House proper, it appears reasonable to place greater restrictions upon the use of these rooms than have heretofore obtained.

The Commission will be glad to pass upon all articles which would go into the East Wing and will establish rules along the lines suggested in your letter. Even though it may not be possible to display the articles until after the war, we agree with you that those offered, which prove acceptable, should be stored and cared for pending the time when they shall find places in the East Wing.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke
Chairman

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

(EXHIBIT C)

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 9, 1942.

My dear Mr. Chairman:-

I wish you would discuss the following matter with the Commission of Fine Arts.

Owing to the war emergency and the need for additional space and for a bomb-proof shelter, the old East Wing of the White House was torn down and the new building is now practically completed. The plans had, I think, the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts.

It has long been my thought that because of the increase in the number of articles of historical interest in the White House itself, the matter of showing them to the public had reached an acute stage. The rooms downstairs containing china and other mementos of former Presidents are, of course, wholly inadequate for this purpose. Furthermore, during the past ten years I have had many offers of actual pieces of furniture and other mementos from the families of former Presidents and others.

Therefore, it was my thought at least eight years ago, when the newest West Wing was built, that something similar should be done with the East Wing, using an enlarged East Wing primarily as a Museum open to the public.

I think that we could devote a number of rooms to certain periods -- as for instance a room covering the Presidents from the first Adams through the second Adams; another room from the 1823 period up to the time of the Civil War; another room from 1865 through, let us say, the McKinley period; and another room from Theodore Roosevelt down to date. This kind of arrangement could, of course, be modified and the number of rooms devoted to separate periods increased to an almost unlimited extent.

The new East Wing will, during the war, be occupied by certain war services, and there will not be much room left for Museum rooms. However, certain articles are still being offered to the White House.

It is my thought that the Commission of Fine Arts should properly pass on all of these articles which would go into the East Wing in the same way that the Commission now passes on articles that go into the White House proper. Certain simple rules should be made. As for example, the giving of priorities to pieces of furniture, pictures and personal belongings which were actually used by a given President in the White House during his term of office.

Every period should be represented: As for instance, the period of Chester A. Arthur which, in relation to furniture and other things, probably represented the highest achievement in bad art ever perpetrated on this nation. However, I have an offer of a desk and chair which were used by President Arthur while in the White House. They are most certainly illustrative of the period, and I am inclined to think that the Commission of Fine Arts would rule favorably on their acceptance.

Please let me have your views on this general subject.

Then if it is impossible to display any accepted articles until after the war, we could at least accept them in the meantime and preserve them for future display.

Very sincerely yours,

Franklin D. Roosevelt

Honorable Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

September 23, 1942

Dear Mr. Tolson:

The sketch for a proposed canopy to cover the north street car platform in front of Union Station which you submitted with your letter of September 14, received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on September 19, 1942.

The Commission of Fine Arts do not favor the proposed scheme and disapprove the sketch.

I have been requested to advise you that in allowing you to construct the temporary taxicab shelter in front of the Union Station, the Commission stretched its acquiescence to this temporary structure to the elastic limit.

I am returning the sketch herewith.

Sincerely yours,

H. P. Caemmerer,
Secretary

Enclosure

Mr. B. R. Tolson, Manager,
The Washington Terminal Company,
Union Station,
Washington, D. C.

(EXHIBIT D)

September 21, 1942

Dear Colonel Nowland,

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on September 19, 1942, inspected the designs and models which you submitted for the proposed "Air Medal" received in response to a recent competition conducted by the War Department. The Commission were pleased to review these designs and models with you and Colonel Hanley.

After giving careful consideration to the submissions of the several sculptors, the Commission came to the conclusion that two submissions were especially meritorious. One of these was submitted by Paul Jennewein; the other by Walker Hancock.

Rather than attempt to make a definite recommendation at this time, the Commission felt that it would not be unreasonable to request these two sculptors to submit sketch models in plaster, six inches in diameter. We would then be in a better position to determine which of the two designs should be selected.

I suggest that you notify these two gentlemen that their work has been selected from among the others, and that you desire an additional submission in plaster before a final decision may be made. I am sure that they will be happy to cooperate to this extent without compensation, with the understanding, of course, that one design will be selected and that sculptor commissioned for the work.

A more detailed outline of the particular designs is as follows:-

1. WALKER HANCOCK

Obverse:

Central motif of Design C (marked Inclosure 8 on list) to be developed on star Design A (marked Inclosure 6 on list), with broader points and <u>without</u> rounded tips.

Central circle, including eagle, to be larger in proportion to the entire medal.

Reverse:

Circular area plain. Delineate compass points only.

Submit plaster sketch model, 6 inches in diameter, of obverse only, in competition with one other sculptor.

2. C. PAUL JENNEWEIN

Obverse:

Design No. 4. Restudy eagle.

While the Chief of the Army Air Forces preferred the eagle shown on "obverse of American Zone," we believe that one to be too stereotyped and similar to the eagle on a number of other medals.

Reverse:

Circular area plain. Delineate compass points only.

Submit plaster model, 6 inches in diameter, of obverse only, in competition with one other sculptor.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke
Chairman

Colonel B. E. Nowland
G-1, General Staff
War Department
Washington, D. C.

(EXHIBIT E)

September 21, 1942

Re: Four "Theater of Operations" Medals

Dear Colonel Nowland,

Following our meeting of Saturday last, I discussed with the members of the Commission the problems incident to securing appropriate and satisfactory designs for these important medals. As a result of these deliberations, I make the following suggestions, which appear to be fair to the competitors and at the same time provide the most satisfactory and effective means for securing designs appropriate in the circumstances.

1. That the competitors who have already submitted designs for these medals be advised that the judgment has been postponed until a later date in order to give each sculptor more time for study and to permit others to submit designs in accordance with a detailed program which is outlined in a statement attached to this letter.

2. That the medalists or sculptors who have already submitted designs should be given the opportunity to add to or to revise their designs and to submit new ideas if they so desire. The designs already submitted should be retained, unless the competitor requests that they be returned. If not returned, they will be judged with the drawings submitted later.

3. That after the new designs have all been received by the War Department, this Commission will meet to review them and to make specific recommendations after conference with you.

4. That at least one month be given to all competitors and that the designs be submitted on white paper mounted on board, as specified in the program, except that designs already submitted will be accepted in the manner in which they have been presented and without prejudice with respect to the method of presentation. While it would be desirable to have all designs submitted as models in plaster, it appears impractical, in this case, to require more than drawings in order to be fair to those who have already made submissions. Hereafter submissions for medals should be in plaster as may be specified later.

5. It is further suggested that all those who were invited to submit designs in the competition for the Air Corps Medal be invited to present designs for all four, or for any one, two, or three of the Theater of Operations medals.

6. It is suggested that, in addition to those medalists invited to submit designs for the Air Corps Medal, the following named be invited:-

Mr. Paul Manship
319 East 72nd Street, New York
Mr. Leo Friedlander
P. O. Box 572, White Plains, N. Y.
Mr. Heinz Warneke
5 Washington Mews, New York
Mr. Henry Kreis
Essex, Connecticut
Mr. Robert B. Howard
521 Francisco Street
San Francisco, California
Mr. Frederick Olmsted
310 Filbert Street
San Francisco, California
Mr. Sargent C. Johnson
2101 Scott Street
Berkeley, California
Miss Berta Margoulies
333 Fourth Avenue, New York
Mr. Raymond Barger
36 East 23rd Street, New York

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman

Colonel B. E. Nowland
G-1, General Staff
War Department
Washington, D. C.

Enclosure - Suggested program for competition
for four Theater of Operations Medals.

SUGGESTED PROGRAM FOR A COMPETITION FOR THE SELECTION
OF FOUR MEDALS FOR THE FOUR PRINCIPAL THEATERS
OF OPERATIONS IN THIS WAR

American Theater)
(
European Theater) Suggest adding a
(brief description
African Theater) of the limits of
(each theater.
Asiatic-Pacific Theater)

1. The medals, in bronze, _____inches in diameter, shall consist of an obverse and a reverse. Each competitor may submit more than one design for each medal or for two or more medals. A sculptor may be awarded commission to carry out one or more of his designs.

2. The reverse shall be the same for all medals. Sculptors may submit one or more designs for the reverse. It is understood that one sculptor may be awarded a commission to carry out one or more of his designs for the obverse and one design for the reverse. Other sculptors may be awarded one or two and up to three designs for the obverse. The Army reserves the right to make all awards,- four designs for the obverse of four medals and one design for the reverse of four medals,- to one sculptor; or the right to award one or more obverse and a reverse to one sculptor and one, two, or three designs for the obverse to one sculptor. The U. S. Army reserves the right to have the design of a reverse and an obverse on any one medal by different sculptors. The compensation in each case will be fifteen hundred dollars for each medal, whether or not the reverse is included.

3. Designs shall be submitted as follows:-

Not more than two designs shall be submitted on one piece of white paper mounted on board in size 12" x 15". Designs shall be placed one over the other so that the long dimension is vertical. Each design shall be 6" in diameter and presented in any medium. One mount may have two obverse or one obverse and one reverse design or a single obverse design.

4. The name and address of the competitor shall be plainly marked on the back of each mount. For purposes of judgment, an identifying number will be placed on the face of the mount by others.

5. The only lettering on the obverse will be the description of the particular theater as indicated in the list at the heading of this program; for example, "American Theater." The reverse shall provide lettering as follows:- (a) United States of America; (b) space for two dates.

6. Care should be exercised in the use and development of symbolism. The several theaters of operation are so large and include such broad geographic limitations that a distinctive emblem representing a single country may not symbolize a whole theater. For example, the kangaroo of Australia is not symbolic of the Far East-Pacific Theater, since China and the Philippine Islands are included.

7. Designs already submitted by competitors on _____, will be held and judged with designs to be submitted by others and without prejudice because of any lack of observance of the regulations with respect to size of drawing, etc., as outlined herein. Competitors who have submitted designs may add to or revise them. Designs already submitted will be returned only

upon request to _____, _____. If designs are resubmitted, they must comply with the provisions of this program.

8. Drawings must be mailed to _____, _____, and placed in the mail not later than midnight of _____, 1942.

9. Accepted drawings will become the property of the U. S. Army. All other drawings will be returned to the competitors.

10. The successful sculptor or sculptors will be required to prepare a plaster model for each accepted design; this will be used as the basis for the preparation of the dies for the casting of the medals. The plaster models will be 8" in diameter and not less than 1½" in total thickness. They will be delivered as directed. The sculptor will assume all responsibility for the arrival of the models in good condition.

September 25, 1942

Dear Colonel Nowland:

Mr. Caemmerer has reported that you look with favor upon the suggestion to extend the program for the "Theaters of Operation" medal to be conducted somewhat along the line indicated in the program which accompanied my recent letter to you on this subject.

Mr. Caemmerer stated further that you have indicated that a period as long as six weeks may be allowed the competitors for the designs submitted in this competition. That being the case, I suggest that the War Department call for the submission of sketch models in plaster, instead of drawings. These plaster models should be not less than six inches in diameter and not less than one inch thickness over-all. It seems to me that the results will be much more satisfactory, since most sculptors are better able to work in the medium of clay and plaster than in pencil or crayon. This suggestion is not my own. It was made by one of the most eminent medalists and sculptors in this country, and I am sure that his ideas on this subject are shared by a large majority of those who will be asked to enter this competition.

I wish to assure you that we desire to be of the greatest possible assistance to you in matters of this character.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke
Chairman

Colonel B. E. Nowland
G-1, General Staff
War Department
Washington, D. C.

(EXHIBIT F-1)

September 19, 1942

My dear Colonel Nowland:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting today had the pleasure of seeing the medals and insignia, particularly of the Air Corps, which you presented a few days ago. They are very interesting and are a valuable contribution to the Commission's collection of medals and insignia.

In behalf of the Commission of Fine Arts, I wish to thank you most heartily for them. They will be referred to from time to time in connection with the work of the Commission.

Very sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman

Colonel B. E. Nowland,
G-1, Military Intelligence,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

(EXHIBIT G)

September 16, 1942

Dear Mr. Budwesky:

Mr. Caemmerer has informed me of your desire to arrange with the City Council to appoint a board or council to advise on architectural problems in their relation to zoning in connection with the development of the City of Alexandria, in particular, concerning the development of Washington Street along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway. The creation of such an advisory board or council is desirable, no doubt, from the point of view of both the City and the Federal Government, in order that the character of Washington Street may be preserved. The agreement between the City of Alexandria and the United States in 1929 indicates interest on the part of the Government in this matter.

Here in Washington plans for private buildings adjacent to certain lands of the Federal Government, including many park areas, are submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts by the Inspector of Buildings of the District of Columbia under the authority of the Shipstead-Luce Act, enacted by Congress on May 16, 1930. During the past twelve years that this law has been in effect, substantial results have been achieved in improving the appearance of streets coming within the area prescribed in the Act.

I venture to suggest the appointment by the City Council of an architectural advisory board or council consisting of not more than three members to have charge of this matter and to represent the Council informally, serving without remuneration. At least two of the members should be architects of established reputation.

The Commission of Fine Arts will be glad to cooperate with you and to render such assistance as may be appropriate in the circumstances.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman

Mr. Carl Budwesky,
City Manager,
Alexandria, Virginia

(EXHIBIT H)

September 21, 1942

Mr. Joseph Barnett
Principal Highway Design Engineer
Federal Works Agency
Public Roads Administration
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Barnett:

This will acknowledge your letter dated September 17 and the prints submitted therewith of Bridge No. 6 on the War Department Building Road Network to carry Lee Boulevard over Boundary Channel from the north end of Columbia Island. This print was considered by the Commission of Fine Arts at a meeting held September 19.

The Commission are satisfied with the general form and silhouette of the bridge, but are of the opinion that the details are altogether too fussy,- in particular, the wing walls and the treatment of the piers.

In the case of the former, it would seem that a good deal of granite masonry might be saved by eliminating the short secondary walls and providing for a simple long wall. The beveled corners where the wing walls join the abutment walls might be simplified to eliminate what appears to be a needless amount of dimensioned granite masonry.

In the case of the piers, it would seem that it would be better to extend the rounded section approximately to the springing line of the arches, and from there up, the surfaces might be flat and without breaks.

One of the details to which the Commission object is the introduction of exposed concrete in a parapet wall. It seems to us that it would be best to have but two materials in the facade of the bridge,- namely, steel and stone. The use of concrete is an exceedingly unfortunate choice. Steel should be substituted in order to effect a more simple and unified appearance over the steel arches.

Inasmuch as a large sum of money is being expended for this bridge, it seems to us that a pipe hand rail of the type indicated is hardly appropriate. At least, it should be further studied and shown in more detail. In this connection, one vertical member, instead of two in pairs, would appear to be more satisfactory.

I attach hereto the print which you sent us. On it, in red pencil, I have made notations somewhat in accord with the criticisms outlined in this communication.

It would be a pleasure to give further consideration to the design after you have had an opportunity to review the suggestions for changes set forth in this letter.

Very truly yours,
Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman

(EXHIBIT I)

September 25, 1942

Dear Mr. Barnett:

I have reviewed the elevations for Bridge No. 15 shown on your Drawing No. 15-BR-05, and find them satisfactory. The following more or less minor changes are suggested:-

a. Add parapet walls to the two wing walls where railing is shown.

b. Provide single instead of double posts for the metal railing over the two arches. This railing is rather conspicuous, and it is important that it be carefully detailed.

c. Lengthen one of the wing walls, as noted on the elevation on the print attached hereto.

d. Use the pier shown on the two elevations on the drawing, rather than the alternate detail as indicated by the insert.

Subject to the revisions noted herein, the design of this bridge is approved.

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke
Chairman

Mr. Joseph Barnett
Principal Highway Design Engineer
Federal Works Agency
Public Roads Administration
Washington, D. C.

(EXHIBIT J)

September 22, 1942

My dear Mr. Clarke:

Saturday afternoon, Mr. Poor, Mr. Stackpole and I enjoyed seeing the mural painting just about completed by Kindred McLeary at the entrance of the new War Department Building at 22nd Street & Virginia Avenue. Mr. McLeary happened to be there and we spent an interesting hour with him.

The painting illustrates four liberties of American life protected by the War Department, namely: freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion and/or social life, and freedom of the ballot. A panel at each end represents activities of the War Department. The painting is 50 feet long by 12 feet high and it has a pleasing color scheme. I asked Mr. McLeary whether he had satisfied the Office of Education regarding a schoolhouse and he pointed out a building that represents a schoolbuilding. At the top of the picture are a series of floating eagles that are superb. At the bottom of each panel are symbols illustrating each of the "liberties."

Mr. McLeary proposes to spend a little time putting finishing touches on the painting. He told us he had spent about three months on the painting. There are fully 2,000 employees of the Adjutant General's Office in the building, and we observed that the people who went in and out of the building enjoyed seeing the painting. It is an inspiration these days to see such a painting as this.

The only particular criticism Mr. Poor had to make was the lack of attention given to, so to speak, a frame for the painting. Mr. Poor said that the place makes the painting look like a large billboard. It needs the statues suggested by the Commission last year to flank the painting, to give it a good setting.

I know you will be glad to see the painting the next time you are in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

H. P. Caemmerer,
Secretary

Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke,
10 Rockefeller Plaza,
New York, N. Y.

(EXHIBIT K)